Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/766,149	RABINOWITZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mina Haghighatian	1616
All Participants:	Status of Application	·
(1) <u>Mina Haghighatian</u> .	(3)	
(2) Barry Swanson.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 7 December 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
19, 21, 29, 31, 39-44		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su</li> </ul>	on. The examiner will provide a varate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
Alte		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representativ	re Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner telephoned Mr. Swanson to discuss a potential new matter issue with the specification and certain claims. It was suggested to Mr. Swanson to change the particle size range of claims 19 and 29 to read "0.1 to 5" and adding the term "about" before "0.2" and "3" in claims 21, 31 and 39- 44. Specification was suggested to be amended to include the same range also. Mr. Swanson agreed to all the suggestions and it was decided to have the amendments done by an Examiner's amendment (attached).